



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/643,583   | 08/22/2000  | Arun K. Gupta        | 102153-100          | 9983             |
| 26541  | 7590        | 05/20/2004           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN<br>12930 SARATOGA AE. SUITE D1<br>SARATOGA, CA 95070 |             |                      | DUONG, OANH L       |                  |
|  |             | ART UNIT             |                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             | 2155                 |                     | /0               |
| DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004  |             |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |                                   |                              |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Advisory Action</b>  | Application No. <u>09/643,583</u> | Applicant(s)<br>GUPTA ET AL. |  |
|   | Examiner<br>Oanh L. Duong         | Art Unit<br>2155             |  |
| <b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <b>PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]</b>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</b></p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p> |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</li> <li>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li> </ul>                         |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>NOTE: _____. </p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). </p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The a)<input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b)<input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. </p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. </p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b)<input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. </p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: </p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____. </p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____. </p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u>. </p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p>   |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing correction filed on ____ is a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved or b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. </p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____. </p>  |                                   |                              |  |
| <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. </p>  |                                   |                              |  |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' argument is not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "executable code that generates a quasi-static copy of a web page is scheduled at periodic intervals") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Li does teach an executable code that generates a quasi-static copy of a web page (i.e., the web server 38 sends this dynamically generated page 50 to the web browser 30, it may also store this page 50 to cache 36, col. 4 lines 13-21) is invoked at defined intervals (i.e., periodically refreshing/synchronizing the web pages in the cache 36 through the web server 38, col. 4 lines line 34-36).



HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER